UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,902	01/03/2001	Frido Garritsen	03935P008	5053

7590 02/26/2004

Glenn E. Von Tersch
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
WALLACE, SCOTT A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2671	7

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/755,902	GARRITSEN, FRIDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott Wallace	2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *7-10,13,14,17,18,20-24 and 31-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *7-10,13,14,17,18,20-24 and 31-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-10, 13-14, 17-18, 20-24, 31-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 7-10, 13-14, 17-18, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Automatically stripping is not taught in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7,13,17,31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,573,199 in further in view of Robertson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,486,895.

6. As per claims 7, 13, 17, 31, Chen et al discloses a method of simulating a second font utilizing a first font (column 2 lines 21-26 and column 7 lines 44-67 and column 8 lines 1-5 and fig 6, #18). However, Chen et al does not specifically disclose the method comprising: stripping a top line and a bottom line from the first font to simulate the second font; wherein the first font comprises an n*(m+2) font and the second font comprises an n*m font. Chen et al does disclose deleting lines from a font to create a different size font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to delete the top and bottom lines because this would not distort the font as much. Chen et al does not disclose doing this reduction automatically. This is disclosed in Robertson et al in column 9 lines 60-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the process of scaling done automatically because this would uniformly scale all the characters on a page so more information could seen on a page that's been scaled.

7. Claims 8-9, 14, 18, 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. in view of Robertson et al in further in view of IBM Tech Disclosure – Font Changer.

8. As per claims 8, Chen et al and Robertson et al does not specifically disclose wherein the first font comprises a 9x16 font; and the second font comprises a 9x14 font. This is disclosed by IBM in Font Changer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a 9x16 and 9x14 font, because these font sizes were well known at the time of the invention therefore it would have been obvious to change from one to the other.

9. As per claim 9, Chen et al and Robertson et al does not specifically disclose wherein the first font comprises a 8x16 font; and the second font comprises a 8x14 font. This is disclosed by IBM in Font Changer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a 8x16 and 8x14 font, because these font sizes were well known at the time of the invention therefore it would have been obvious to change from one to the other.

10. As per claims 14, 18, 32, Chen et al and Robertson et al does not specifically disclose wherein m=14. This is disclosed by IBM in Font Changer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have m=14 because this font size were well known at the time of the invention therefore it would have been obvious to change from one to the other.

11. As per claim 33, Chen et al and Robertson et al does not specifically disclose wherein n is one of 8 and 9. This is disclosed by IBM in Font Changer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have n = 8 and 9 because this font size were well known at the time of the invention therefore it would have been obvious to change from one to the other.

12. Claims 10 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al in view of Robertson et al in further in view of Lee, U.S. Patent No. 6,337,687.

13. As per claims 10 and 34, Chen et al and Robertson et al discloses simulating the second font as seen above. However, Chen et al and Robertson et al fail to teach copying the n*(m+2) font from BIOS into memory. Lee discloses copying the BIOS information in memory in column 3 lines 5-20 and column 4 lines 48-53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the font information from BIOS into memory as in Lee with the system of Chen and Robertson because this would allow for faster execution time when changing font size (column 4 lines 48-53).

14. Claims 20-24, 35-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, U.S. Patent No 6,337,687 in view of Chen et al.

15. As per claims 20, 35, 40, 45, Lee discloses a BIOS memory (column 3 lines 5-20), the BIOS memory storing a first font and instructions (column 3 lines 5-20); and a processor coupled to the BIOS memory (fig 2, #27 and 28). However, Lee does not disclose the processor emulating a second font utilizing the first font. This is disclosed in Chen et al in column 2 lines 20-26. It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to emulating fonts as in Chen with the system of Lee because this would save memory.

16. As per claims 21, 37, 42, 47, Chen discloses wherein the processor emulating the second font by stripping a portion from the first font in response to receiving an access for the second font (column 7 lines 44-53).

17. As per claims 22, 36, 41, 46, Lee discloses a first memory coupled to the processor (fig 2, #27 and 28), copying the BIOS memory into the first memory (column 4 lines 48-53). However, Lee does not disclose the processor emulating a second font utilizing the first font. This is disclosed in Chen et al in column 2 lines 20-26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to emulating fonts as in Chen with the system of Lee because this would save memory.

18. As per claim 23, Chen does not disclose the portion comprises a top line and a bottom line of an n*(m+2) font. Chen et al does disclose deleting lines from a font to create a different size font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to delete the top and bottom lines because this would not distort the font as much.

19. As per claim 24, Chen discloses the second font comprises an n*m font (column 7 lines 44-67).

20. As per claims 38, 43, 48, Chen does not disclose wherein the portion comprises a top line of the each character of the first font and bottom line of each character of the first font. Chen et al does disclose deleting lines from a font to create a different size font. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to delete the top and bottom lines because this would not distort the font as much.

21. As per claims 39, 44, 49, Chen discloses wherein the second font is of two lines of pixels shorter than the first font. Chen discloses deleting lines to reduce the font to another font size depending on the users choice. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, if two lines were chosen to be deleted, then the second font would be two lines of pixels shorter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Wallace** whose telephone number is **703-605-5163**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at 703-305-9798.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

MARK ZIMMERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600